

A
17
LETTER

To the REVEREND

Mr. *ALAN LOGAN*,

Minister of the Gospel at *Culross*.

CONTAINING

SOME REMARKS on an anonymous
Preface annex'd to the late Edition of
the *Westminster* Confession of Faith.

By a Member of the Church of Scotland.



Printed in the Year M. DCC. XXII.

TO THE
HONORABLE
MEMBERS OF THE
HOUSE OF COMMONS

IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED
THAT THE PETITION OF
THE SEVERAL LORDS OF THE
COMMONS OF GREAT BRITAIN
IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED



L
R
Y

very
you
ing
ough
self,
Perse
and
cern
fence
of yo
me i



A

LETTER, &c.

REVEREND SIR,

YOU might justly be offended at an Address of this publick Nature, were not the Subject Matter a sufficient Apology. And indeed unless I had thought it a very important Business, I should not have given you this Trouble. But when any Thing is going wrong among us, I know not any one I ought rather to have Recourse unto than your self, who are by all good Judges esteemed a Person of so great Learning, solid Judgment and quick Penetration; who can so easily discern the Truth, and are so zealous in the Defence of it. The high Notions I had conceiv'd of your Honesty and Impartiality encouraged me in this: For you not only bravely preserve

to this Day your heroick Zeal against Professor S——n's Errors, but are also daily giving fresh Proofs of your warm Concern for Truth. For when a Number of Ministers published some peculiar Doctrines, you opposed them with the honest Boldness of a faithful Minister of our blessed Lord. Whatever other Motives, arising from Differences among us, might engage some to be Enemies to these good Men, I am persuaded it was nothing but a hearty Zeal for what you were convinced was the Truth of the Gospel, induced you to appear against their Notions.

When you reflect a little, you will with me be very much surpris'd, that while a Preface to the *Marrow*, &c. has been so loudly cry'd out against, yet a Preface to a most excellent Book, even our Confession of Faith, has not been publickly censured by any Member of this Church (that I know of) tho there are so many Things obnoxious in it.

Your honest Regard for Truth is a Proof to me, that you scorn to use any Arguments but such as are strong and conclusive; that you have a just and noble Abhorrence against saying any Thing that is weak or false, to support the best Cause: And therefore I have chosen to direct to you some few Reflections upon that Piece, not doubting but you will be as zealous against this Performance of a single Person, as against a Representation of Twelve
reverend

reverend Brethren. And to engage you to this, I shall in this Epistle lay before you the evil Nature and dangerous Tendency of this Piece; which will appear if we consider,

I. *That he evidently betrays the Cause he pretends to defend.*

II. *That he betrays it in such a Manner as gives Countenance to the most dangerous Doctrines and vilest Practices.*

I. *He betrays our Cause while he pretends to defend it.* This will appear if we consider, *imo*, That he rejects the only good and conclusive Arguments for our Cause, I mean those drawn from Scripture, *Pag. 51.* And this he does for a Reason which any Man who pretends to be a Member of the Church of *Scotland*, should blush to mention, *viz.* because it would engage him in *many intricate Questions about the divine Right of our Government, and the Authority of Church-Officers:* And therefore since the Power of Scripture-Bishops or Presbyters, and the Qualifications of Ministers, are (in his Opinion) left so vague and undetermined in the Word of GOD, and perplexed with so many Intricacies, he excuses himself from such knotty Work, as to defend Presbytery from Scripture, or ascertain the Qualifications our Lord Jesus Christ requires of his Ministers. But, Sir, I hope we are not so degenerate as to believe our Cause is wrapt up in so much Darkness, or that Presbytery is so hard

to be found in the Bible. I am sure every Minister declares otherwise at his Ordination; and if this Gentleman had ever read Mr. *Anderson's* Book, or many others; had he lookt to the 20th of the *Acts*, or the Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, and other Parts of Scripture, he would have found that Presbytery was plainly and evidently contained in the Bible, and the Qualifications of Ministers fully and clearly fixt and determin'd. But alas! according to his View of Things, the Scriptures were so obscure and dark in these Points, as not to give the least Spark of Light; and therefore he lays them aside as useless in the present Case, in Order to make Room for the Fancies of his own Brain. And can you, Sir, without a deep Concern behold to how low an Ebb the Authority of our dear Redeemer is sunk? Can you without Grief observe, that the Determinations of the holy Scriptures are set aside and neglected, even while we are pretending to defend the Practice of a Christian, of a Protestant Church? Can there be any Way to prove that Christians act as they ought to do, but by showing their Conduct is conform to the Commands of their great and only Lord and Master? Do we not all profess to believe the Scriptures to be the only and sufficient Rule? What then must the World about us think, to see joined to our Confession of Faith, a Preface which defends our Practice, not by shewing

shewing its Conformity to the Scriptures, which we assert to be the only Rule; but because it is agreeable to I know not what upstart airy Notions of Cabals of Men and Rights of Societies. Every one must own that he has chosen the most improper Way of defending us. What can be said in Defence of the Man who tells us *Pag. 58.* that he considers the *Church as a CHRISTIAN Society entered into for spiritual Purposes*, and yet sets aside the Declarations of Jesus Christ, the only Head and Lawgiver to his Church. Can we have a Right to do any Thing as Christians which is not conferred upon us by the Lord Jesus? Is it not then evidently betraying our Cause, to disregard and reject all our Proofs taken from Scripture? What would you think of an Advocate who undertook to defend your Title to an Estate, and yet neglected to adduce an Act of the Legislator, which alone gave you Right to that Estate, and was the only just Foundation of your Claim?

But *2do*, Lest rejecting the Scripture-Proofs should not expose our Cause enough, he defends it by such Reasoning as is obviously false and inconclusive: For all the Defence he makes for the Church of *Scotland* is, That she acts as a Christian Society ought to do, because all that is done in Societies is Right, and therefore she being a Society cannot do wrong.

To prove which, I shall give you the Principles

ciples on which he goes. They are contained from Pag. 52. to Pag. 58. inclusive. The Argument, to do him Justice, shall be stated in his own Words, cutting off only such idle Epithets and airy Circumlocutions as do not affect the main Argument.

Pag. 52. *As Freedom is the Birthright of Mankind, any Number of Persons may voluntarily unite themselves, to such Purposes and under such Regulations as appear useful and convenient to them. Religion is the brightest Glory of rational Creatures, and therefore 'tis reasonable Men should unite together in worshipping Assemblies.* Pag. 53. *Every religious Society hath a natural Privilege of worshipping in that Way, and acting in every Case as they believe themselves directed by the supreme Rule of Faith. Every Society hath a Right to determine to whose Government it shall submit in its spiritual Concerns.* Pag. 54. *Every Society must have the Liberty to judge for themselves what Faith they would have preached to them, and to determine what Doctrines and Articles of Faith they expect the Belief of from their Pastors.* Pag. 56. *When the greater Part of a Nation enter into a Society of this Nature, there will arise what may be understood by a national Church, and the Articles of Faith received by them will become a national Confession. But our Church was united together by the same Faith and Hope, the Members of it embraced the*
Truths

Truths contained in her Confession ; she therefore has an inherent Right to confine her Choice of Ministers to such as will preach these Doctrines, in the Appointment whereof, Authority of both Kinds, Civil and Sacred, Acts of Parliament and Assembly, concurred.

This Argument is in short this, Every Society have a Right to make what Rules of Belief or Practice they think fit for themselves : But our Church as a religious Society has received our Confession, therefore she is right in so doing. What is this but in other Words to say, That our Church acts as a Christian Society ought to do, because she, as a Society, has agreed to do what she does, and therefore she does Right : As if every Thing done by every Society were right and just, barely because they do it, and a Society could do no wrong. Strange ! that this Author, had he really designed it, could not have defended us at least with something that had the Shew of Reasoning. Must we, if we will see our Practice vindicated, be contented likewise to behold the Foundations of all Morality sapt and destroyed, Right and Wrong changed with every Corporation, and the eternal Rules of Reason made as variable and uncertain as the different Humors of Men are ? Could so ingenious a Gentleman be ignorant that every Society, yea the whole rational World, is eternally and unalterably obliged to follow that which is right and just ;
and

and therefore tho they should meet in one grand Assembly, and by an unanimous Vote agree to dissolve these Obligations, yet they would still remain as firmly bound as ever, tho they talkt as loudly of the Rights of Society, to act in every Case *as they believe Right*, as the Prefacer himself?

How came a Society to have the Privilege of doing any Thing they please, more than every Individual? And I hope our Author will not say that every individual Person has a Right, a full unquestionable Right, to do what he pleases. The Law of the great GOD, and not the Pleasure or Opinion of a Society, is to be their only Rule. Nor can I imagine it possible for them to have any Right to deviate from the divine Commands. Consider Men as you please, either in a State of Nature, or blest with a Revelation, they are still obliged to obey GOD; nor can any Number of them met together dissolve this Obligation, or have a Right to contradict the Injunctions of their Creator in the least Particular.

In a State of Nature the Laws of Reason are our only Guide, but these are too fixt and stable to be altered by the Votes of every Club. For I believe it will be very difficult to find out whence a Society derives a Right of doing what they please. GOD never gave any of his Creatures a Right to do wrong, nor can any created Being have such a Right from himself

himself, as little can he derive it from his fellow Creatures. As long as we continue reasonable Creatures, we are obliged to follow the Rules of Reason; as long as the Character subsists, the Obligations resulting from that Character remain in full Force: And therefore no created Being can have a Right to do any Thing but what his Creator enjoins. The Light of Nature informs us of no Injunctions from our Creator, but such as are fit and reasonable in themselves: And therefore had our Author designed a real Defence, he would have shown, our Practice was reasonable in itself considered; that is, he would have proven that if such a Practice obtained in the World, it would certainly do more Good than Harm: He would have shown it was conducive to the Glory of GOD, and the universal Benefit of Mankind. Had he done this, he might undeniably have concluded that we have a Right to exercise such a Practice, because rational Creatures have an unquestionable Right to do all the Good they can.

But instead of this he says, The Society does it; therefore they have a Right to do it; or, it is reasonable; just as if every Thing done by every Society was so. When different Societies contradict each other, and tho one Society is for Creeds, another Society may agree there shall be no Creeds, I suppose they have a Right to do this too by the Prefacer's Principles.

ciples. But what is the Meaning of this Right
 of Society his Head was so filled with? Is it
 that every Society acts wisely and rationally in
 whatever they do? Or, that what they do is
 pleasing to GOD? Or that none of their fellow
 Creatures may quarrel and condemn their Pra-
 ctice, or give a Testimony against it? I am
 perswaded he can mean none of these. 'Tis
 a strange Kind of a Right then, that neither ex-
 empts from Guilt and Censure in this World,
 nor Condemnation and Punishment in the next.
 Should I demand of this Author if any Society
 can do wrong, no doubt he will answer, Yes,
 since different Societies have done contrary
 Things. What a poor and trifling Defence then
 of any Practice is it to say it was done by a So-
 ciety? What can follow from that, but perhaps
 it is right, perhaps it is wrong. And since at
 present, with respect to Religion, there are
 more Societies wrong in the World than right;
 to vindicate a religious Practice by saying it is
 done by a Society, is in a very notable Way to
 defend it by saying it is more probable it is er-
 roneous than just and reasonable. But perhaps
 he means no more than that if once a Society
 have voted any Thing, no Man must contra-
 dict them; or, in his Stile, a *Stranger must*
not intermeddle. But I believe, Sir, you will
 with me be of Opinion, that it is a natural and
 unalterable Duty to inform Men of their Mi-
 stakes and Errors, and to endeavour by all the
 Methods

Meth
 to bri
 my
 porta
 when
 dispe
 and i
 Bu
 not
 whic
 this
 to di
 exho
 and
 I
 long
 conf
 eter
 Mea
 pinic
 T
 to e
 GO
 Pra
 reve
 he
 term
 he
 pre
 Pra
 to b

Methods of Reason, Argument and Persuasion to bring them to a better Mind. Can I love my Neighbour as I ought, and neglect so important a Favour as to exhort and rebuke him when it is necessary? And he is under an indispensable Obligation to amend what is amiss, and is highly culpable if he does not hear me.

But what is the Reason why a Stranger must not intermeddle? Because the Matter about which he concerns himself has been voted. But this is a strange Efficacy of counting Voices, to dissolve a natural Obligation upon me to exhort, and upon him to amend. But in Truth and Reality it only lays a Foundation for both.

I ask your Pardon for detaining you thus long to prove a Thing so evident, That if we consider Men in a State of pure Nature, the eternal Rules of Reason are the Standard and Measure of Right and Wrong, and not the Opinions of Men or Votes of Societies.

Then consider us as Christians, we ought to embrace or establish no Doctrines but what GOD has revealed, nor observe any religious Practice but what he has enjoined. What GOD reveals is to be received and embraced, because he reveals it; not what Men are pleased to determine by a Plurality of Voices. So that if he consider us as a Christian Society, as he expressly tells us he does, in order to justify our Practice as good and useful, he should shew it to be agreeable to, and founded upon the Word
of

of GOD; and not barely tell us it is done by a Society. For what follows from this? Societies are frequently wrong: Therefore to say a Thing is done by a Society, is only telling a Fact, and can be no Proof at all of the Justice, Fitness or Equity of that Fact.

There is only one Thing I would mention in this Place, which relates to the Provision made by the Gospel for the Subsistence of Ministers. Every faithful Minister of Jesus Christ, who labours in Spirituals, ought to have a competent Provision made for him: And can we do right, or act as Christians, while we deny this? Because as a faithful Steward of Divine Mysteries, he declares to us the whole Council of GOD, shall we therefore deprive him of Food and Raiment, because he would not confine his Discourses to our wrong Notions? Has an *Arian* Society Right to deprive a faithful Minister of his Stipend, because in his Sermons he will not shamefully deny the Lord that bought him? The Prefacer indeed says, Men may dispose of their Money as they think fit, to encourage what Doctrines they please, or retain it to discourage them; *Every Society is Master of its Favours*, Pag. 70. But I ask if they can do this innocently? which I suppose they cannot, since it is appointed that those who preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel. If they can't do it innocently, to say they have a Right to do it, is to use Words without

any Meaning, or to say Men have a Right to contract Guilt. So that consider us in what Character you please, either as Men or as Christians, the Opinions of Societies are no Rule to us, nor can it be a good Argument for any Practice to say it was done by a Society.

I would beg Leave to observe *3tio*, That in Order to defend us in his Way, he must necessarily suppose a Fact which never happened, That the whole People of *Scotland* met together as a Society to embrace and establish the Confession of Faith. As far as my own little reading goes, I never met with any such Fact in History. But should he mean no more than that each Congregation met by itself and received the Confession, I am still at a Loss to know where he reads this. We know it was composed by the Assembly of Divines at *Westminster*, but when did particular Congregations approve it? But if by the whole Nation he means that very small Part that met in Presbyteries, Assemblies or Parliaments, and plead that the People has received it by their Representatives: To this no Doubt it will be answered, That it is very new and surprising, to talk of Peoples receiving their Creed by Deputies, or embracing Doctrines by Commissioners: It is very odd that this should drop from the Pen of one, who contends that free Choice is the very Soul of Religion, and every Man must follow the Dictates

Dictates of his own Conscience, *Pag.* 57 According to this Way of arguing, we must not blame the *Papists* for blindly assenting to the Determinations of Councils, since the Members that compose these Assemblies are Persons entrusted by them for this Purpose: And after this we must not charge it as a Crime on the *Papists* to maintain implicate Faith; or if we do, must be content to come in Partners with them in their Guilt, since we imitate their Conduct. And further by this Means the heavy Yoke of Patronages is immoveably bound upon us; for that being done by the Representatives of the People is thereby according to him, rendered as reasonable as Presbytery itself: For no Doubt People may as well transfer the Choice of a Minister to another Person, as they can devolve the Choice of the Doctrines, that Minister is to preach, upon their Representatives. But seeing our Practice is right in itself, we don't need such Acts to defend it. Tho' our Author having invented a very odd Defence taken from the Rights of Society, he seems to have found himself obliged in order to make that Defence run the better, to invent the Society too, *Pag.* 56. But should our Adversaries allow there was such a Society met, that would be of no Service to our Cause, unless the Practice were just and reasonable in itself. And if it be right in itself, we don't want the Votes of the People to justify our Conduct. And is it not evidently

ly to betray a Cause, under a pretended Defence, when a Man argues a Practice is just and good, because the Multitude approves it.

But I am perswaded, Sir, you will be yet further displeased with this Performance, when you observe, *That he betrays the Cause in such a Manner as gives Countenance to the most dangerous Doctrines and vilest Actions.* To evince this consider, *First*, That this Author contrary to the Principles of this Church, is for unbounded Toleration, Pag. 54. *Every Society must judge for themselves, what Faith they would have preach'd to them.* Again, Pag. 55. *Nor can any other assume an Authority over them to oblige them to bear Doctrines which they disbelieve and disregard, or hinder them from being instructed and animated in that Faith which their Consciences (tho' erroneous) teaches them they ought to embrace.* And at the Bottom of this Page, he ever supposes them making a wrong Choice of their Faith; and adds, that *this alters not the Matter.* I wish the Gentleman before he wrote this, had given himself the Trouble to read the Confession he wrote a Preface to Cap. 23. §. 3. where it is declared to be the *Magistrates Duty to take Order that Unity and Peace be preserved in the Church, that the Truths of GOD be kept pure and entire; That ALL Blasphemy and HERESIES BE SUPPREST.* This, Sir, is the Opinion of the Church of Scotland; Tho,

B

according

according to the Preface, every Person in every Society, has a Right founded, *as deep as Nature*, to choose and follow what Faith they please, and none must disturb them in the Enjoyment of their natural Rights; and therefore they have a Right of introducing into the Nation whatever wild Notions they please, and have the same Right to make a publick Profession of these Errors as we have of those Doctrines which are the Truths of G O D. I would likewise here demand, if this does not overthrow the true End and Design of our Confession to keep out vile Heresies from among us. For if this Scheme of unbounded Toleration be allowed, how can our Confession of Faith answer these Ends, if all Doctrines without Distinction may be preach'd and propagated among us? Perhaps he may say, still the Church will be pure. If by the Church be meant the People of every Congregation, this I am afraid will not be the Case; but many of them having itching Ears, will be easily seduced by cunning Hereticks. And then upon his Scheme, Confession will produce this notable Effect, that so many as remain sound will be sound.

And can you think, Sir, That such a Performance deserves the Honour of being prefixed to our Confession of Faith? I am satisfied you cannot, especially when you consider, that if his Principles be allowed to be true, the exclusion

clusion of the Ministers from their Churches in the late evil Times, cannot be complained of as unjust and wicked: *Every Society is Master of its own Favours, Pag. 70. Abstracting a Benefice is no Persecution*, when the Minister differs in his Notions from the People, or which amounts to the same, the People from him; *Page. 58.* For, according to the Preface, a Minister is to be instructed by his People what he is to teach them: They first give him his Lesson, and he repeats it to them; and if he fails to teach them Doctrines suited to their Fancies, they may withdraw his Emoluments or Salary; to which (according to our Author) he has no Right any longer than he follows the Notions of the People, *Pag. 58. For he must be regulate by their Constitutions, which if he depart from, he evidently forfeits any Title he had to his Stipend: If he contradicts them, they may justly starve him. Pag. 55. It must be allowed for the Rulers of that Society to take proper Measures whereby it may be discovered, whether a Person is qualified for an Ecclesiastical Office.* N. B. He is here speaking of a Society without Ministers, but going to choose them; and therefore by Rulers must be meant civil Rulers. But the Rulers in the late Times judged our worthy Ministers unqualified for the Office of publick Teachers, and therefore expelled them from their Charges, which (according to our Author) they had a Right to do without

out

out the least Imputation of Persecution, the Ministers being unqualified to teach these Doctrines they thought proper.

Nay, he lays a good Foundation for the like Treatment of our Ministers, if they are resolved to continue faithful in corrupted and iniquitous Times. For suppose the Generality of the People should become infected with the Contagion of *Arianism*, then would they, according to the Preface, have an undoubted Right to turn out our faithful Gospel Ministers, and set up *Arian* Teachers in their Room. But is it not very strange and surprising, that our departing from the Truth should give us a Right to male-treat honest and worthy Ministers, *i. e.* our being guilty of one Crime give us a Right to commit another?

Yea, so big with Absurdities is his Scheme, that it justifies the establishing Societies of *Atheists, Deists, Socinians, Arians, Arminians, &c.* For if these Wretches meet together in a Cabal, they have a *Right founded as deep as Nature*, to establish what Doctrines they please. And how soon this may be the Case no one knows, if this Scheme takes place, and People are taught to turn out their Ministers, because themselves get new Notions.

Again, it is a strange undervaluing our Confession of Faith, to put it so evidently upon a Level with the *Alcoran* of the *Mahumetans* and *Trent* Catechism of the *Papists*: For these

Books

Book
mero
same
sent
a Rig
prop
of th
orth
Fu
Man
Socie
rect
Conc
than
Forei
found
ment
be ju
and g
engag
of S
these
Conf
ranny
nage
vertu
ing v
undo

Abfu

Books having been received in Societies numerous enough, they are imposed with the same Justice and Right that we require an Assent to our Confession: For the People having a Right to impose what they please, or seems proper to them, it is nothing but the Exercise of their natural Right to impose either the one or the other of those Books.

Further, if his Principles are just, That no Man ought to meddle with the Affairs of a Society of which he is not a Member, or direct them in the Management of their religious Concerns, to which he gives no softer Names than *Intrusion* and *Usurpation*, (*Pag. 52. No Foreigner can intrude himself into a Society founded upon Consent, or usurp the Management of its Concerns:*) If these Principles, I say, be just, they evidently condemn our worthy and godly Covenanters, who did so solemnly engage to extirpate Popery, Prelacy, &c. out of *Scotland, England and Ireland*. But since these were so many Societies founded upon Consent, it was *Intrusion, Usurpation* and *Tyranny* in these holy Men to interfere in the Management of their Concerns, or pretend to overturn and dissolve these Societies, who having voted their Errors, had a just Right to the undoubted Possession of them.

And to mention but one more of the many Absurdities that follow from his Principles, We
all

all know, That when Christianity first appeared, the World was cantoned into so many religious Societies; and therefore, according to the Preface (Pag. 54. *No Man, tho he thinks himself extremely qualified to advance these Ends [viz. Government and Instruction] can intrude himself into a Society that thinks otherwise;*) the Apostles were guilty of usurping an arbitrary Power, when they entred the Synagogues to preach to the *Jews*, or direct them in their spiritual Concerns. For this certainly was the Intrusion of a Foreigner. But if he makes their extraordinary Commission a sufficient Excuse for them, he cannot fail to condemn any Minister of this Church, who would go into a Society of our Papists, and so far interfere with their spiritual Concerns, as to exhort them to amend their Errors. Are not these Societies founded upon Consent? Is not he a Foreigner to their Society; and therefore ought not so far to usurp a Power of teaching and instructing them, who think him unqualified for that Work? This, tho a plain and necessary Duty, is with the Prefacer *Intrusion and Usurpation*.

You will observe, Sir, that I have past over several other lesser Things censurable in this Piece: For I thought it sufficient to show how shamefully he has betrayed our Cause, if I evinced that his most plausible Arguments plainly did this, and that the main Reasoning, upon which

which he founds his Defence of our Practice,
 is so very false and dangerous. And here I
 must observe, that this being the main Prin-
 ciple he uses to answer the Objections of Ad-
 versaries, if this be found insufficient and false,
 all their Objections stand in full Force against
 us, notwithstanding any Thing he has done :
 For after the long Work of almost 200 elabo-
 rate Pages, he has left the Cause worse than he
 found it : And tho he has made the Church
 the Complement of a Defence, he does indeed
 betray her Cause, and expose her to the In-
 sults of her Foes. And therefore I am humbly
 of Opinion, that some abler Hands and stronger
 Heads should be appointed to vindicate the
 Practice of our Church in obliging Ministers
 to subscribe our Confession. I should in this
 Epistle have essayed something of this Kind,
 had not I seen the late Attempt of a pri-
 vate Hand so very unsuccessful. And there-
 fore I rather chose to obtest and beseech you,
 or some of your reverend Brethren, as you re-
 gard the Glory of the great GOD, and of our
 blessed Lord and Saviour; as you are concern-
 ed for the Honour of the Church of *Scotland*,
 the Purity of Gospel Doctrines, and the Tran-
 quillity and Peace of our *Zion*, to undertake
 with all Expedition the useful and seasonable
 Work; and to use your utmost Endeavours
 at the ensuing Assembly, to remove by Au-
 thority

thority that unworthy Performance from the high Place it now stands honoured with ; that Strangers may not imagine its being joined to our Confession, is a Proof of our Church's Approbation of it.

F I N I S.



m the
; that
ned to
i's Ap-